# 2018 Current Fiscal Year Report: Strategic Environmental Research and **Development Program Scientific Advisory Board**

Report Run Date: 06/05/2019 05:56:01 AM

2. Fiscal Year 1. Department or Agency

2018 Department of Defense

3b. GSA 3. Committee or Subcommittee Committee No.

Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program 437

Scientific Advisory Board

4. Is this New During Fiscal 5. Current 6. Expected Renewal 7. Expected Term

Year? Charter Date Date

No 09/04/2017 09/04/2019

8a. Was Terminated During 8b. Specific Termination 8c. Actual Term

FiscalYear? Authority Date

10 U.S.C. 2904 No

9. Agency Recommendation for Next10a. Legislation Reg to 10b. Legislation

Terminate? **FiscalYear** Pendina?

Continue Nο Not Applicable

**11. Establishment Authority** Statutory (Congress Created)

12. Specific Establishment 13. Effective 14. Commitee 14c.

**Authority** Presidential? Date Type

10 U.S.C. 2904 11/05/1990 Continuing No

**15. Description of Committee** Scientific Technical Program Advisory Board

16a. Total Number of No Reports for this

FiscalYear Reports

17a. Open 2 17b. Closed 0 17c. Partially Closed 0 Other Activities 0 17d. Total 2 Meetings and Dates

Purpose Start Fnd Review FY2019 New Start projects 10/17/2017 - 10/17/2017 Review FY2019 New Start projects 10/18/2017 - 10/19/2017

Number of Committee Meetings Listed: 2

	<b>Current FY</b>	Next FY
18a(1). Personnel Pmts to Non-Federal Members	\$0.00	\$0.00
18a(2). Personnel Pmts to Federal Members	\$7,906.00	\$17,414.00
18a(3). Personnel Pmts to Federal Staff	\$29,000.00	\$60,000.00
18a(4). Personnel Pmts to Non-Member Consultants	\$0.00	\$0.00
18b(1). Travel and Per Diem to Non-Federal Members	\$12,902.00	\$42,954.00
18b(2). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Members	\$0.00	\$9,482.00
18b(3). Travel and Per Diem to Federal Staff	\$0.00	\$7,553.00

 18b(4). Travel and Per Diem to Non-member Consultants
 \$0.00

 18c. Other(rents, user charges, graphics, printing, mail, etc.)
 \$7,360.00
 \$23,497.00

 18d. Total
 \$57,168.00 \$160,900.00

 19. Federal Staff Support Years (FTE)
 0.10
 0.30

## 20a. How does the Committee accomplish its purpose?

The SERDP Scientific Advisory Board responsibilities, as prescribed by Title 10, U.S.C., Section 2904 and modified by the SERDP Council, are to: review proposed research projects equal to, or in excess of, \$1 million, however, the Council, in an effort to enhance the Board's review process, subsequently lowered the Board's dollar threshold to any proposed research projects in excess of \$900,000, and make recommendations to the SERDP Council regarding the projects reviewed; assist and advise the Council in identifying environmental data and provide analytical assistance within the scope of SERDP; make recommendations to the Council regarding technologies, research, projects, programs, activities, and if appropriate, funding within the scope of Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program; provide additional advisory support as directed by the Council and develop procedures for accomplishing these responsibilities. During this fiscal year, the Scientific Advisory Board reviewed and made recommendations on twenty eight proposed projects to the Council.

# 20b. How does the Committee balance its membership?

Title 10, U.S.C. Section 2904 requires the joint appointment of the members of the Scientific Advisory Board by the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of Energy, in consultation with Administrator of the EPA, or their designee, thereby ensuring a membership that meets the approval of all principal participating Agencies. Equitable representation between scientists and engineers, and representing women and minority groups was a principal consideration. Membership includes: The designee of the Science Advisor to the President; the designee of the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration; nomination(s) from the Heads of National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering and Institutes of Medicine; nomination(s) from the Council on Environmental Quality, representing environmental public interest groups; and nomination(s) from the National Association of Governors, representing the interests of State governments. As members leave the Board, the membership is reviewed to identify areas of expertise that may require new members in order to maintain a balanced membership. With the exception of the permanent Board members, Board members, are appointed from eminent individuals in the fields of basic sciences, engineering, ocean and environmental sciences, education, research management, international and security affairs, health physics, health sciences, or social sciences, with due regard given to the equitable representation of scientists and engineers who are

women or who represent minority groups.

### 20c. How frequent and relevant are the Committee Meetings?

Meetings are conducted a minimum of four times a year, in accordance with the statute, to assist the SERDP Council to make annual programmatic and policy decisions. This is the minimum number of meetings necessary to allow sufficient time for the Board to review of all the projects being considered for funding during a fiscal year prior to making a recommendation to the Council.

# 20d. Why can't the advice or information this committee provides be obtained elsewhere?

Federal statute (10 U.S.C. 2904) requires the Secretary of Defense to establish this committee.

## 20e. Why is it necessary to close and/or partially closed committee meetings?

Meetings are not closed to the public unless the DoD determines the items on the planned agenda meet the closed meeting provisions of 5 U.S.C. § 552b(c). Pursuant to DoD policy closed meetings can only be authorized by the DoD Sponsor, the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Logistics, and only after consultation with the Office of the DoD GC.

#### 21. Remarks

By statute the SERDP SAB is required to have as a member, the designee of the Science Advisor to the President. This office has not yet been able to offer a replacement for the last member who left the board in January of 2017. The committee does not issue any specific report; their recommendations are contained within their meeting minutes, which are provided to the decision maker. Pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2904, the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program (SERDP) Scientific Advisory Board (SAB) reports to the Strategic Environmental Research and Development Program Council. SERDP does not have any subcommittees. Much of the support for the committee is done by contractors reducing the amount of FTEs necessary. The agency decided to only hold two meeting in the FY18 fiscal year.

#### **Designated Federal Officer**

Start

End

Committee

Herb Nelson Director and Program Manager for Munitions SERDP & ESTCP

Members

Special Joseph 00/42/2047 00/44/2020 Nebrooks Department of Environmental Quality.

Occupation

Francis, Joseph 09/12/2017 09/11/2020 Nebraska Department of Environmental Quality

Hughes, Joseph 03/13/2012 03/12/2018 Dean, College of Engineering, Drexel University

Member Designation

Special Government Employee (SGE) Member Special Government Employee (SGE) Member

Distinguished University Professor of Soil Science, Special Government Employee Lal, Rattan 06/19/2012 06/18/2018 The Ohio State University (SGE) Member Distinguished Professor Emeritus, University of Special Government Employee 03/13/2012 03/12/2018 Sayler, Gary (SGE) Member Schoof, Special Government Employee 09/12/2017 09/11/2020 Principal, Ramboll Environ Rosalind (SGE) Member 05/01/2014 04/30/2019 Director, Physical Sciences Regular Government Employee Webb, Robert Division/NOAA/OAR/ESRL (RGE) Member

**Number of Committee Members Listed: 6** 

## **Narrative Description**

The SERDP Scientific Advisory Board's (SAB) collective expertise and experience, assures that the Program maintains clear focus on technical and scientific quality and the environmental needs of the DoD. The SAB reviews all new start and continuing projects with a value in excess of \$900,000 to ensure technical quality and fiscal responsibility. Furthermore, the SAB assures that multiple projects responding to the same or similar requirements are complementary in approach and well coordinated.

# What are the most significant program outcomes associated with this committee?

Checked if Annlies

	Onoonoa ii Appiioo
Improvements to health or safety	
Trust in government	
Major policy changes	
Advance in scientific research	✓
Effective grant making	
Improved service delivery	
Increased customer satisfaction	
Implementation of laws or regulatory requirements	
Other	✓

#### **Outcome Comments**

The SAB makes recommendations regarding technologies, research, projects, program, activities, and if appropriate, funding within the scope of the SERDP. Their collective knowledge and expertise assures that SERDP is pursuing research that addresses high-priority requirements and fosters technology transfer. Their thorough review and evaluation of proposals, in addition to the Peer Review Panels, assists the Program in identifying cooperative research efforts that demonstrate the highest standards of technical and scientific quality. The Board plays a proactive role in identifying and defining environmental research gaps and associated technology development opportunities.

What are the cost savings associated with this committee?

	Checked if Applies
None	
Unable to Determine	✓
Under \$100,000	
\$100,000 - \$500,000	
\$500,001 - \$1,000,000	
\$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	
\$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	
Over \$10,000,000	
Cost Savings Other	
Cost Savings Comments	
It is difficult to put an actual dollar amount on the savings, a	as their contributions are
significant in assisting in identifying the most effective meth	ods, potentially beneficial
research efforts, highest quality technical and scientific rese	earch, collaborative efforts, and
technology transfer opportunities.	
What is the approximate Number of recommendations	produced by this committee
for the life of the committee?	
1,202	
Number of Recommendations Comments	
A recommendation is made by the SAB on each project rev	viewed during each fiscal vear.
	The state of the s
What is the approximate Percentage of these recomme	ndations that have been or
will be Fully implemented by the agency?	
100%	
% of Recommendations Fully Implemented Comments	
NA	
What is the approximate Percentage of these recomme	ndations that have been or
will be Partially implemented by the agency?	
0%	
O/ of Donous and Indiana Dadd III II	
% of Recommendations Partially Implemented Comme	nts

Does the agency provide the committee with feedback regarding actions taken to

NA

implement recommendations or advice offered?  Yes ✓ No ☐ Not Applicable ☐	
Agency Feedback Comments  The projects are rebriefed with the SAB recommendations incorporately a written or verbal report with the issues addressed.	orated, or the staff
What other actions has the agency taken as a result of the correcommendation?	ommittee's advice or
	Checked if Applies
Reorganized Priorities	✓
Reallocated resources	<b>√</b>
Issued new regulation	
Proposed legislation	
Approved grants or other payments Other	<u></u>
Action Comments  The Program decided not to fund a project, eliminated specific tas project pending receipt of additional information or decreased fun the project as a study.	,
Is the Committee engaged in the review of applications for go	rants?
Grant Review Comments NA	
How is access provided to the information for the Committee	e's documentation? Checked if Applies
Contact DFO	✓
Online Agency Web Site	
Online Committee Web Site	
Online GSA FACA Web Site	
Publications Other	

# **Access Comments**

N/A